UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/726,758	12/03/2003	Roy Schoenberg	66729/P029US/10613663 4221	
	7590 01/09/200. & JAWORSKI L.L.P	EXAMINER		
2200 ROSS AVENUE			LEWIS, CHERYL RENEA	
SUITE 2800 DALLAS, TX 75201-2784			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2167	
			MAII DATE	DEL IVERY MODE
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/09/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

•	<u> </u>					
		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
		10/726,758	SCHOENBERG, ROY			
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
		Cheryl Lewis	2167			
Period for	The MAILING DATE of this communication app Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
WHICH - Extension after SIX - If NO pe - Failure to Any repl	RTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY EVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DAYS THE MAY BE AVAILABLE OF THE MAILING DAYS (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. The provision of the specified above, the maximum statutory period we or reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, y received by the Office later than three months after the mailing patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status						
1)⊠ R	esponsive to communication(s) filed on 16 Oc	ctober 2007.				
2a) <u></u> ⊤ا	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.					
•						
cl	osed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	i3 O.G. 213.			
Disposition	of Claims					
4a 5)□ C 6)⊠ C 7)□ C	laim(s) <u>1-52</u> is/are pending in the application. Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw laim(s) is/are allowed. laim(s) <u>1-52</u> is/are rejected. laim(s) is/are objected to. laim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration.				
Application	ı Papers					
	e specification is objected to by the Examiner	r.				
·	10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.					
Αţ	oplicant may not request that any objection to the o	drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See	e 37 CFR 1.85(a).			
	eplacement drawing sheet(s) including the correcti e oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •				
Priority und	der 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
2) Notice o 3) Informat	f References Cited (PTO-892) f Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) ion Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) o(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	nte			

Application/Control Number:

10/726,758 Art Unit: 2167

DETAILED ACTION

- 1. This Office Action is in response to the applicants' communication received on October 16, 2007.
- 2. Claims 1-46 are presented for examination.
- 3. The applicants have cancelled claims 47-55. The applicants have not amended or added any new claims.
- 4. Applicants' arguments with respect to claims 1-46 have been considered but are deemed to be most in view of the new grounds of rejection.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Application/Control Number:

10/726,758 Art Unit: 2167

Claims 1-46 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-52 of copending Application No. 10/727184. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the limitations of claims 1-46 of the instant application are similarly claimed in claims 1-52 of application no. 10/727184.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

NAME OF CONTACT

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cheryl Lewis whose telephone number is (571) 272-4113. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:30-3:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Cottingham can be reached on (571) 272-7079. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

(571) 273-4113 (Use this FAX #, only after approval by Examiner, for "INFORMAL" or "DRAFT" communication. Examiners may request that a formal paper/amendment be faxed directly to them on occasions.).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist/ Technology Center (571) 272-2100.

Application/Control Number:

10/726,758 Art Unit: 2167

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/<u>Cheryl Lewis/</u> Patent Examiner, A.U. 2167 January 2, 2008